

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed April 18, 2006. Claim 18 is cancelled and claims 7, 12 and 16 are amended. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-13 and 15-18 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph for indefiniteness on the grounds that the term "the magnetic field" lacks proper antecedent basis. In response, Applicants have amended both claims 7 and 16 to refer instead to dependent claims 6 and 15 respectively which properly set forth the term "magnetic field." Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner's allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 11 is appreciated. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the careful review and allowance of those claims. In addition, the Examiner indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, which Applicant has done.

The Examiner has also indicated that claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 12 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 18. As acknowledged by the Examiner, that claim is patentably distinct from the prior art, and is now in a condition for allowance. Moreover, for at least the same reason, claims now depending from claim 18 – namely, claims 13 and 15-17 – are also in a condition for allowance.

In summary, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10-13, and 15-17 are now pending in view of the above amendments, and all are patentably distinct from the prior art. Allowance of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

III. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejects claims 12-13 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over combinations of *Cathey* (U.S. Patent No. 6,027,619), *Sathrum* (U.S. Patent No. 6,139,964) and *Sanders* (U.S. Patent No. 5,282,944). While Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, in the interests of moving the case to allowance, the rejected claims have been amended in the manner acknowledged by the Examiner so as to constitute allowable subject matter. As such, the above rejections are believed to be moot, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 18th day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric L. Maschoff/ Reg. No. 36,596

ERIC L. MASCHOFF

Registration No. 36,596

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

Telephone: (801) 533-9800